

**EFFECTS OF SHEEP MANURE APPLICATION ON THE PRODUCTION OF
DWARF NAPIER GRASS (*PENNISETUM PURPUREUM* CV. MOTT)**

By

SHOKRI BIN JUSOH

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in
Fulfilment of the Requirement for the Degree of Master of Science**

December 2005

DEDICATION

This Thesis is dedicated to:

My beloved parents, sisters and family for their true love and encouragement

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in the fulfilments
of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science

**EFFECTS OF SHEEP MANURE APPLICATION ON THE PRODUCTION OF
DWARF NAPIER GRASS (*PENNISETUM PURPUREUM* CV. MOTT)**

By

SHOKRI BIN JUSOH

December 2005

Chairman: Associate Professor Mohd Ridzwan Abd Halim, PhD

Faculty: Agriculture

Studies were conducted to evaluate the utilization of sheep manure as fertilizer for growing Dwarf Napier grass (*Pennisetum purpureum* cv. Mott). The grass received one of six maintenance N fertilizer treatments namely: 1) control, 2) 200 kg N ha⁻¹ from urea, 3) 200 kg N ha⁻¹ from sheep manure, 4) 100 kg N ha⁻¹ from sheep manure, 5) 50-50 mixture of sheep manure and urea at the rate of 200 kg N ha⁻¹ and 6) a 50-50 mixture of sheep manure and urea of 100 kg N ha⁻¹. Urea was applied in 4 split applications per year while sheep manure was applied once over a 12 month period.

The effect of types of fertilizer used on the growth performance and nutritional quality of the grass were evaluated in study 1. The organic fertilizer as either sheep manure alone or as combination with urea gave better growth performance of the grass in terms of tiller height, tiller number and leaf area index over 6 cycles of 6 weeks per cycle. The treatment with 200 kg N ha⁻¹ of sheep manure gave highest dry matter yield (16 t ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹) compared to control (10 t ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹). The leaf: stem ratio of the grass shows that the leaf fraction increased significantly over time. The urea fertilizer gave higher crude protein (13%) compared to 12% in other treatments. Grass fertilized with mixed fertilizer gave

higher NDF (73.21%), ADF (40%) and sheep manure gave higher ash concentration (>10%) and low ADL concentration (<0.25%).

Study 2 was conducted to assess the effects of different fertilization regime on the soil chemical properties. The soil fertilized with sheep manure and urea were not significantly difference over a 12-month period. The sheep manure also sustained the plant nutrient in the soil, which was indicated by stabilised soil organic matter and cation exchange capacity over six month. The overall availability of macronutrients in the soil was increased in the soil fertilized with sheep manure compared to control and urea treatments.

The influence of the types of fertilizer used on the ensiled product of the grass was determined in Study 3. The urea fertilized silage gave highest concentration of acetic acid (87.5 mm/L) while the silage with sheep manure as fertilizer gave higher concentration butyric acid (110.3 mm/L) and it contributed to the aerobic stability of the silage. When these plants were later used in animal feeding trial, the intake of silage by lambs was higher for grass silage fertilized with urea and control (800 g day⁻¹) than other treatments. However, the grass silage under organic fertilizer, either as sheep manure only or a mixture of sheep manure provided better digestibility (>60%). The average daily gain of the lambs fed grass silage show that the fertilized grass, i.e.: sheep manure and urea (130 g day⁻¹) was higher compared to control (<50 g day⁻¹). The treatments with sheep manure and mixed fertilizer did not show any differences in terms of animal performance.

In conclusion, the organic fertilizer, either as sheep manure alone or in combination with urea can be used to fertilize pasture grass because it was found relatively better as compared to urea fertilizer alone. This is because it gave a good balance between yield and nutritive quality.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia dalam memenuhi keperluan penganugerahan ijazah Master Sains.

**KESAN APLIKASI TINJA BIRI-BIRI KE ATAS PRODUKSI RUMPUT NAPIER
KERDIL (*Pennisetum purpureum* cv Mott)**

Oeh:

SHOKRI BIN JUSOH

Disember 2005

Pengerusi: Profesor Madya Mohd Ridzwan Abdul Halim, PhD

Fakulti: Pertanian

Satu kajian di ladang telah dijalankan untuk menilai penggunaan tinja biri-biri sebagai baja untuk menanam rumput Napier Kerdil (*Pennisetum purpureum* cv. Mott). Rumput menerima salah satu dari enam rawatan baja senggaraan N iaitu: 1) kawalan, 2) 200 kg N ha⁻¹ dari urea, 3) 200 kg N ha⁻¹ dari tinja biri-biri, 4) 100 kg N ha⁻¹ dari tinja biri-biri, 5) campuran 50-50 tinja biri-biri dan urea pada kadar 200 kg N ha⁻¹ dan 6) campuran 50-50 tinja biri-biri dan urea pada kadar 100 kg N ha⁻¹. Urea diberikan dalam 4 pecahan aplikasi setahun manakala tinja biri-biri diberikan sekali sahaja dalam jangkamasa 12 bulan.

Kesan jenis baja yang digunakan ke atas prestasi tumbesaran dan kualiti pemakanan rumput telah dinilai dalam kajian 1. Baja organik sama ada tinja biri-biri sahaja atau sebagai kombinasi dengan urea menunjukkan prestasi tumbesaran yang lebih baik dari segi tinggi tiler, bilangan tiler dan indeks kawasan daun sepanjang enam pusingan dengan 6 minggu sepusingan. Rawatan dengan 200 kg N ha⁻¹ tinja biri-biri memberikan hasil berat kering tertinggi (16 t ha⁻¹ tahun⁻¹) berbanding dengan kawalan (10 t ha⁻¹ tahun⁻¹).

Nisbah daun: batang rumput menunjukkan fraksi daun telah meningkat dengan bererti mengikut masa. Baja urea memberikan konsentrasi protein kasar lebih tinggi (13%) berbanding 12% dalam rawatan lain. Rumput yang dibaja dengan baja campuran memberikan konsentrasi NDF (73.21%), ADF (40%) dan tinja biri-biri memberikan konsentrasi abu (>10%) yang lebih tinggi dan konsentrasi ADL (<0.25%) yang lebih rendah.

Kajian 2 telah dijalankan untuk menilai kesan pembajaan ke atas sifat-sifat kimia tanah. pH tanah yang dibaja dengan tinja biri-biri dan urea tidak berbeza dengan bererti dalam jangkamasa 12 bulan. Bahan tinja biri-biri juga mengekalkan nutrien tumbuhan dalam tanah, berdasarkan kestabilan bahan organik tanah dan keupayaan pemegangan kation dalam jangkamasa enam bulan. Kedapatan keseluruhan nutrien makro dalam tanah telah meningkat dalam tanah yang dibaja dengan tinja biri-biri berbanding rawatan kawalan dan urea.

Pengaruh jenis baja yang digunakan ke atas produk rumput peram telah ditentukan dalam kajian 3. Silaj dari rawatan urea memberikan konsentrasi asid asetik tertinggi (87.5 mm/L) manakala silaj dengan tinja biri-biri sebagai baja memberikan konsentrasi asid butirik tertinggi (110.3 mm/L) dan ianya menyumbang kepada kestabilan aerobik silaj. Apabila tumbuhan kemudiannya digunakan dalam ujian pemberian makanan, pengambilan silaj oleh anak biri-biri menunjukkan silaj rumput yang dibaja dengan urea dan kawalan memberikan pengambilan lebih tinggi (800 g hari⁻¹) berbanding rawatan lain. Walau bagaimanapun, silaj rumput di bawah baja organik, sama ada tinja biri-biri sahaja atau baja campuran memberikan pencernaan lebih baik (>60%). Purata kenaikan berat badan anak biri-biri diberi makan silaj rumput menunjukkan bahawa rumput dibaja iaitu tinja biri-biri dan urea (130 g hari⁻¹) adalah lebih tinggi berbanding kawalan (<50 g hari⁻¹). Rawatan dengan tinja biri-biri dan baja campuran tidak menunjukkan sebarang perbezaan dari segi prestasi haiwan.

Sebagai kesimpulan, baja organik sama ada sebagai tinja biri-biri sahaja atau dengan kombinasi dengan urea boleh digunakan untuk membaja rumput pastura kerana didapati

secara bandingannya lebih baik berbanding dengan baja urea sahaja. Ini adalah kerana ia memberikan keseimbangan yang baik antara hasil dan kualiti pemakanan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses his sincere appreciation to Assoc. Prof Dr Mohd Ridzwan Abdul Halim, Assoc. Prof Datin Dr Rosenani Abu Bakar and Prof. Dr Abd Razak Alimon for their guidance, support, encouragement and patience throughout the author's period of graduate studies and in the preparation of the thesis manuscript.

Grateful thanks and appreciation are due to Assoc. Prof Dr Azhar Kasim, Head and the staff of the Department of Animal Science and the Faculty of Agriculture, and the fellow graduate students for their encouragement and support.

Deep appreciation is also due to Department of Public Services, Malaysia and Universiti Putra Malaysia for providing scholarship and study leave, respectively.

Sincere appreciation and gratefulness are also extended to the staffs of Analytical Nutrition Laboratory, Department of Animal Science, Soil Chemistry Laboratory, Department of Land Management and Nutrition Laboratory, Department of Crop Science for the facilities and technical support by their staff in particular Mr Saparin, Haji Halin, Mr Ibrahim, Mr Bakari, Mr Sabri, Mr Abid, Mrs Rusnah, Mrs Zabadah, Mr Jamil, Mr Rahim and also the staff of Field Two especially Mr Islahuddin, Mr Baharuddin, Mr Jamiuddin, Mr Zakaria and Mrs Anggamah for their assistance in conducting the experiment.

Special thanks to my father, Jusoh Osman, mother Aminah Saleh, sisters Salihah and Mashitah, for their support and encouragement.

Finally, this manuscript and the work it represents could not have been achieved without the patience and understanding of the author's loving wife, Rogayah, sons, Afiq and Arif and daughters Amirah, Madihah, Fathiyah, `Adilah and Aisyah.

I certify that an Examination Committee has met on 28th December 2005 to conduct the final examination of Shokri bin Jusoh on his Master of Science thesis entitled Effects of sheep manure application on the production of Dwarf Napier grass (***Pennisetum purpureum*** cv. Mott) in accordance with Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Act 1980 and Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (higher Degree) Regulations 1981. The Committee recommends that the candidate be awarded the relevant degree. Members of the Examination Committee are as follows:

Hawa Jaafar, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Agriculture
Universiti Putra Malaysia.
(Chairman)

Azhar Kasim, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Agriculture
Universiti Putra Malaysia.
(Internal Examiner)

Anuar Abd. Rahim, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Agriculture
Universiti Putra Malaysia.
(Internal Examiner)

Sayan Tudsri, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Agriculture
Kasetsart University, Thailand.
(External Examiner)

HASANAH MOHD. GHAZALI, PhD

Professor/Deputy Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

This thesis submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science. The members of the Supervisory Committee are as follows:

Mohd Ridzwan Abdul Halim, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Agriculture
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Datin Rosenani Abu Bakar, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Agriculture
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Abdul Razak Alimon, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Agriculture
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

AINI IDERIS, PhD

Professor/Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Date:

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at UPM or other institutions.

SHOKRI BIN JUSOH

Date: 20 APRIL 2006

TABLE OF CONTENT

DEDICATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
APPROVAL	x
DECLARATION	xii
LIST OF TABLES	xvi
LIST OF FIGURES	xviii
LIST OF PLATES	xx
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxi

CHAPTER

1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of Problem	5
	Objectives	6
2	LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1	Farming Systems and Environment	7
2.2	Organic Livestock Farming	9
2.3	Organic Fertilizers	10
2.3.1	Type of organic fertilizers	11
2.4	Mineralization of Organic Matter	13
2.5	Nutrient Uptake	16
2.6	Effects of Organic Matter on Soil Properties	17
2.6.1	Soil physical properties	18
2.6.2	Soil chemical properties	19
2.6.3	Soil biological properties	21
2.6.4	Beneficial enzymes activities	22
2.6.5	Effects on soil fertility	23
2.7	Forage Production and Effects of Farmyard Manures (FYM) on Nutritive Quality	24
2.7.1	Agronomic properties	25
2.7.2	Forage production	25
2.7.3	Adverse effects of manure application on grass	27
2.8	Tropical Forages	28
2.8.1	Elephant grass/ Napier grass (<i>Pennisetum purpureum</i>)	29
2.8.2	Dwarf elephant grass/ Napier grass/ Mottgrass (<i>Pennisetum purpureum</i> cv. Mott)	30
2.8.3	Grass silage	31

3.	METHODOLOGY	33
3.1	Location of Experiment	33
3.2	Experimental Treatments and Lay-out	34
3.2.1	Treatments	34
3.2.2	Experimental design and plot lay-out	39
3.2.3	Soil type	41
3.3	Study 1: Effects of Urea, Sheep Manure and Mixed Fertilizer on the Agronomic Properties and Nutritional Quality of Dwarf Napier Grass	41
3.3.1	Grass growth performance	41
3.3.2	Estimation of grass yield and leaf stem ratio	42
3.3.3	Chemical analysis of plant tissue	43
3.4	Study 2: Effects of Urea, Sheep Manure and Mixed Fertilizer on Soil Chemical Properties.	44
3.4.1	Soil sampling	44
3.4.2	Soil chemical analysis	45
3.5	Study 3: Effects of Urea, Sheep Manure and Mixed Fertilizers on the Quality of Dwarf Napier Silage	48
3.5.1	Silage making process	48
3.5.2	Silage sampling	49
3.5.3	Chemical composition of silage	49
3.5.4	Aerobic stability test	51
3.5.5	Digestibility trials	52
3.6	Statistical Analysis	55
4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	56
4.1	Meteorological Data	56
4.2	Effects of Urea, Sheep Manure and Mixed Fertilizer on Agronomic Properties and Nutritional Quality of Dwarf Napier Grass.	58
4.2.1	Tiller height	58
4.2.2	Tiller number	66
4.2.3	Leaf area index (LAI)	74
4.2.4	Dry matter yield	83
4.2.5	Leaf stem ratio	87
4.2.6	Chemical composition	90
4.3	Effects of Urea, Sheep Manure and Mixed Fertilizer on Soil Chemical Properties.	96
4.3.1	Soil pH	96
4.3.2	Soil organic matter (SOM)	99
4.3.3	Soil cation exchange capacity (CEC)	101
4.3.4	Extractable phosphorus (P)	103
4.3.5	Exchangeable cations	104
4.3.6	General effects on soil chemical properties	108
4.4	Effects of Urea, Sheep Manure and Mixed Fertilizer on the Quality of Dwarf Napier Silage.	109

4.4.1	Chemical composition	109
4.4.2	Aerobic stability test	110
4.4.3	Digestibility trials	112
4.5	General Discussion	115
5	CONCLUSION	117
	REFERENCES/ BIBLIOGRAPHY	120
	APPENDICES	132
	BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR	139